

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

INFORMATION REPORT

This Document contains information affecting the National Defense of the United States, within the meaning of Title 18, Sections 793 and 794, of the U.S. Code, as amended. Its transmission or revelation of its contents to or receipt by an unauthorized person is prohibited by law. The reproduction of this form is prohibited.

SECRET
SECURITY INFORMATION

25X1

COUNTRY	East Germany	REPORT	
SUBJECT	Military Council of the 4th Guards Mechanized Army	DATE DISTR.	11 September 1953
DATE OF INFO.		NO. OF PAGES	2
PLACE ACQUIRED		REQUIREMENT NO.	
		REFERENCES	

25X1

25X1

THE SOURCE EVALUATIONS IN THIS REPORT ARE DEFINITIVE.
THE APPRAISAL OF CONTENT IS TENTATIVE.
(FOR KEY SEE REVERSE)

25X1

1. Col. (fnu) Kurguzov was president of the Party Commission at GOFG level. The Commission was made up of seven colonels and dealt with all breaches of Party and/or Army discipline.
2. The Military Council of the 4th Guards Mechanized Army was this level's equivalent of the Party commission. In principle, the Military Council met once a month, though sometimes a month was skipped when circumstances permitted. The Council met in a special conference room at the 4th Guards Mechanized Army headquarters. Meetings were held under the chairmanship of Army Commander Major General (fnu) Kalinichenko with the Member of the Military Council, (Chlen Voennogo Soveta) Col. (fnu) Purin, and Army Chief of Staff, Major General Koshelyev, acting as assistants. The three officers sat behind a red-baize table on a dais. The head of the Political Branch of Army Headquarters sat a little to one side of the table. He could make suggestions to the three members of the council but had no deciding voice in their decisions.
3. The Council conference room had about 80 seats ranged behind tables. Meetings could be attended by all officers holding the commands of units of departments in Army Hq. within the 4th Guards Mechanized Army, or by division commanders and certain senior staff officers, according to the circumstances or subjects to be discussed.
4. Meetings attended by both categories of commanders usually took up such questions as discipline and finances, e.g., traffic accidents. The head of the Automobile Department of the 4th Guards Mechanized Army, would make an expose of breaches in traffic regulations, naming specific

SECRET/SECURITY INFORMATION

STATE	#x	ARMY	#x	NAVY	#x	AIR	#x	FBI		AEC									
-------	----	------	----	------	----	-----	----	-----	--	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

(Note: Washington Distribution Indicated By "X"; Field Distribution By "#".)

ARCHIVAL RECORD

PLEASE RETURN TO
AGENCY ARCHIVES, BLDG. A-1

SECRET/SECURITY INFORMATION

-2-

25X1

units in which traffic discipline was bad. A divisional commander (if the unit so named were subordinate to a division) might then be called to account for the lack of traffic discipline in his formation. Next, the commander of the offending unit would be asked to state his case.

5. Although the divisional commander was responsible for all traffic discipline within his formation, a regimental commander in whose unit traffic discipline was persistently reported as bad would be publicly admonished at the Military Council meetings and an entry would be made in his service record (lichnoe delo) noting that he "had been warned that he /i.e., his unit/ did not fully conform to standards of service". (In official Soviet Army parlance: Preduprezhden o ne polnom sluzhebnoy sootvetstviy.) An officer who improved the traffic discipline in his unit after official admonition and received good marks at the annual inspections would have the entry in his service record removed. If, on the other hand, unit discipline did not improve, the officer would probably be brought before an officers' Court of Honor to receive punishment, sometimes as extreme as dismissal from the service. Receiving a sentence from an officers' Court of Honor did not preclude Party disciplinary action also being taken against the offender. Party disciplinary action could be taken against officers below the rank of captain by the Party Commission of an army, and against officers up to lieutenant colonel by the Party Commission of GOFG level. Party disciplinary action could only be taken against colonels and higher by the Central Committee of the Communist Party in Moscow.
6. The Member of the Military Council was empowered to make independent reports to his counterpart at GOFG level, and could present opinions not necessarily in agreement with those of the army commander. He was obliged, however, to make known to his commander the contents of his independent reports.
7. An army operations order would be signed by the army commander and the army chief of staff and countersigned by the Member of the Military Council.
8. The appointment of the Member of the Military Council was a political one. This position was, in some ways, a relic of the days of political commissars in the "Red Army" and had survived the doctrine of "Sole Command" (yedinonachaliye).

SECRET